

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—Sir, it is a continuing Session and naturally these questions will be carried over to the next Session.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Questions lapse when there is prorogation of the House. Now, there is no prorogation. The House will be simply adjourned until it is summoned again. The questions will naturally go to the next Sitting.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—As far as these 104 questions are concerned, the Government can approach the Speaker for extension of time, and when approached, it is your discretion to permit or to refuse permission.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—What happens if the permission is refused?

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—If the permission is refused, we come under the discipline of the House. Further, I may add that the Government is very anxious to furnish information for all the questions that the hon'ble members have tabled, within the 15 days time. We are making our honest and sincere efforts and when we find that it is not possible to collect the information within 15 days, we are entitled to approach you and convince you and get extension of time. Suppose, you refuse permission, that matter will come up before this House.

Notice of a Privilege motion *re* : non-fulfilment of assurance to amend the Land Revenue Act

Sri M. NAGAPPA.—I had given a notice of Privilege Motion against the Council of Ministers about the private members' Bill in the previous Session in the month of September and the assurance given by the Minister for Revenue.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I shall give my Ruling and shall explain the situation to the House. Hon. Member Sri Nagappa approached me regarding this matter several times. It is said that the Hon. Minister for Revenue gave an assurance that the Government would come forward with a legislation and on that assurance Sri Nanje Gowda withdrew his Bill, which was meant to amend the Land Revenue Act. The promised assurance not having been fulfilled, the case of Sri Nagappa is that the Hon. Minister for Revenue has committed a breach of privilege. I told him, if an assurance, for some reason or the other is not fulfilled, it does not amount to a breach of privilege. Supposing a post-dated cheque is given, the person who has issued the cheque cannot be said to have committed any offence. This case is just like that.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Supposing it is dishonoured!

Mr. SPEAKER.—Even then, unless it is proved that at the time of issuing the cheque he had any *mala fide* intention, it is no breach. I find, after going through the Governor's Address, that they are coming with an amendment Bill. Now the question is, if it is not brought in the present sitting, what should be done. Next Session is only a continuation of this Session. Under the circumstances, I am holding the view tentatively, that no breach of privilege has taken place. If the hon. Member wants to show any authority let him do it immediately.

3-00 P.M.

† **Sri H. V. KOUJALGI** (Minister for Revenue).—Sir, in the last Session, of course, I said that the Government will move the necessary amendment so that the resettlement would be taken up. In fact I also told while requesting Mr. Nanje Gowda to withdraw his non-official Bill that the necessary amendment to the Land Revenue Act would be made. In fact in the Governor's Address, in the last but one para, it is stated that the Land Revenue Amendment Bill will be introduced. Now the Bill is ready and it will be introduced.

Sri M. NAGAPPA.—I have got respect for the Hon. Minister. With due respect to him, I say the entire Council of Ministers are responsible for the statement made on the floor of the House. If any statement is made on the floor of the House, they must have to fulfil it. If they do not do it, it will amount to misleading the House. Such an incident has happened once in the Parliament. A Minister promised in the Lok Sabha that he would furnish some information. But he was unable to furnish the required information. There was some little delay. It was considered as a breach of privilege of the House. So every delay in furnishing the required information as promised will amount to a breach of privilege. As I have already stated, I have got respect for the Hon. Minister. But the Council of Ministers, as a whole, has not fulfilled the assurance given on the floor of the House. There is a Lok Sabha Ruling in this connection. Therefore there is a breach of privilege.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎನ್. ಎ. ಚನ್ನೇಗೌಡ (ಪಾಂಡವಪುರ).—ಸ್ವಾಮೀ, ಮಾನ್ಯ ಕಂದಾಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಆ ದಿವಸ ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿದಾಗ ಇಂತಿಂತ ಜಮೀನುಗಳಿಗೆ ಹೀಗೆ ಕಂದಾಯ ಹಾಕಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಪುನರ್ವಿಮರ್ಶೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿರುವುದು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಪ್ರೊಸೀಡಿಂಗ್ಸ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿದೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಪ್ರತ್ಯೇಕವಾದ ಆದೇಶಗಳನ್ನು ಆಯಾ ಡೆಪ್ಯುಟಿ ಕಮಿಷನರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇನೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದರು. ಈಚೆಗೆ ಡೆಪ್ಯುಟಿ ಕಮಿಷನರಿಂದ ಮೂರು ಸುತ್ತೋಲೆಗಳು ಬಂದಿವೆ. ಒಂದರಲ್ಲಿ ವೆಟ್ ರ್ಯಾಂಡ್ಸ್‌ಗೆ ಅಪ್ಪು ಆಗುವ ವಿಚಾರ ಇದೆ. ಎರಡನೇ ದರಲ್ಲಿ ಗಾಡನ್ ರ್ಯಾಂಡ್ಸ್ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಇದೆ ಮತ್ತು ಸ್ಪೆಸಿಫಿಕ್ ಅಫೇಕ್ಟ್ಡ್ ಎರಿಯಾದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಇದೆ. ಮೂರನೇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಖುಷಿ ಜಮೀನುಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆ ದಿವಸ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತ ಈಗ ಮಾಡಿರುವ ರೀತಿ ಕ್ಲಾಸಿಫಿಕೇಷನ್ ಮಾಡಿರುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಮತ್ತು ಇದರ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನಿರುವ ಕಲಮು 112 ತಪ್ಪು ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಸುತ್ತೋಲೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಳುಹಿಸಿರುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ, ಇದರಿಂದ ರೈತರಿಗೆ ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಅದುದರಿಂದ ಇದನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ರೈತರಿಗೆ ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗದಂತೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—I congratulate Mr. Nagappa for having studied this case thoroughly. But his arguments are misplaced. In the Governor's Address, the Government have expressed their intention to introduce the amending Bill in the Assembly. When that is so, where is the point of breach of privilege? It would not amount to a breach of privilege. I am sorry that his arguments are beside the point.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have heard Sri Nagappa in support of his motion. He says there is a breach of privilege. But the Chair thinks it does not amount to breach of privilege. At the time of giving the assurance, there was no *mala fide* intention on the part of the Government. If there was any *mala fide* intention, the Government would not have stated in the Governor's Address that they would bring forward that Bill. Therefore the allegation that the Government never intended to fulfil the assurance is not correct. The Hon. Member has quoted the ruling of Lok Sabha. Every case will have to be decided on its merits. I do not think it applies to the present case. The assurance given was that the Government would bring that particular piece of legislation. According to the assurance given, they are bringing that piece of legislation. His promise is fulfilled. A little while ago, the Hon'ble Minister has stated that the Bill is going to be introduced in the next session. The present session will continue till it is prorogued. So, I do not find any breach of privilege. I think the Hon. Member is aware that there is a Committee of Assurances constitutes and it is the business of that Committee to examine all the assurances given on behalf of the Government from time to time. The Assurances Committee will look into all these assurances. It is doing a very good work. It will see whether the assurances given on the floor of the House are fulfilled otherwise it will take action. As I said earlier, there is no *mala fide* intention on the part of the Government, and therefore I hold that it would not amount to any breach of privilege.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—The Hon. Minister was pleased to state that the amending Bill is going to be introduced in this House. I want to know whether the Government is going to constitute a Committee to go into the question of resettlement and on the consequent rise of the land revenue. I want to know that the 3 circulars subsequently issued, refers to only a pattern of land or to all the classes of land. So, I request the Hon. Minister for Revenue to make it aptly clear whether the circulars issued cover all classes of resettlement which you have assured to the House.

† ಶ್ರೀ ಹೆಚ್. ವಿ. ಕಾಜಲಗಿ.—ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ನಂಜೇಗೌಡರು ಒಂದು ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ತಂದಾಗ್ಗೆ ಈ ರಿವಿಷನ್ ಸೆಟಲ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ತಪ್ಪಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಈಗ ಇರುವ ಮೈಸೂರು ರ‍್ಯಾಂಡ್ ರೆವಿನ್ಯೂ ಆಕ್ಟ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಏನು ಇದೆಯೋ ಅದನ್ನು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಮಾಡಲಕ್ಕೆ ಈ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭೆಗೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಇದೆಯೇ ಹೊರತು ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಮೈಸೂರು ರ‍್ಯಾಂಡ್ ರೆವಿನ್ಯೂ ಆಕ್ಟ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ಕಲಂಗಳು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಆಗಬೇಕೋ ಅದನ್ನು ವಿಚಾರ ಮಾಡಿ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ತರುತ್ತೇವೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದರು. ಈಗ ಗಾರ್ಡ್ಸ್ ರ‍್ಯಾಂಡ್ ಮತ್ತು ವೆಟ್‌ರ‍್ಯಾಂಡ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ತಕರಾರು ಇದೆ. ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಹಳಿದರದ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು, ಹೊಸದರದ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ತೆಗೆದು

ಕೊಳ್ಳಕೂಡದು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಮುಂದಿನ ಶಾಸನ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅಂದರೆ ಫೆಬ್ರವರಿ ತಿಂಗಳಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ತರುತ್ತೇವೆ. ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಅಗ ಒಂದು ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಬಂದ ನಂತರ ಎಲ್ಲ ತಕರಾರು ಇವೆ ಎಂದು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡು ಅದನ್ನು ಸರಿ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA (Periyapatna).—I beg to submit that at the time when Sri Nanje Gowda withdrew the Bill, the Hon. Revenue Minister was good enough to assure this House that until the power is taken by the Government through an amendment of the Act, they are going to collect land revenue on the basis of the old rates. That was the assurance given to this House. I learn from fairly authenticated authorities that circulars have been issued directing the officers to collect land revenue on dry land as per new rates contemplated in the revision settlement, in regard to wet land in some other manner and in regard to garden land in some other manner. This would go against the spirit of the very assurance that the Hon. Minister for Revenue held out to this House. I would like to request the Hon'ble Minister to kindly enlighten this House on these points: whether Government has, in contradiction of their own assurance, issued any direction to the officers that land revenue should be collected on the basis of the new rates in respect of dry land, it should be collected in some other manner in the case of wet land, and in some other manner in the case of Bagayat or garden lands. Recently, when I went to my place, I came to know from the officers themselves that directions have been received by them that land revenue on dry land must be collected on the basis of new rates. I request the Hon'ble Minister for Revenue to clear the doubts that have arisen in the minds of the hon. members.

(MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER in the Chair)

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಶ್ರೀಕಂಠಯ್ಯ.—ನಿನ್ನೆ ದಿವಸ ಕಂದಾಯವನ್ನು ವಸೂಲು ಮಾಡುವುದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ನೀತಿ ಏನು ಎಂದು ಅಲ್ಪ ಕಾರಾವಧಿ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಕೇಳಿದ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಪ್ಲಂಬರ್, ನವಂಬರ್, ಜನವರಿ ತಿಂಗಳಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಹೊರಡಿಸಿದ ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಸರ್ಕ್ಯೂಲರುಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟರು. ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ತೆರಿಗೆಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟಂತೆ ಪಾಲಿಸಿಯನ್ನು ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆಯೇ ಹೊರತು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಚೆನ್ನ ಬಸಪ್ಪನವರು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಂತೆ ಬುಟ್ಟಿ ಜಮೀನಿನ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಅನುಸರಿಸುತ್ತೇವೆ ಎಂಬುದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮೂರು ಸರ್ಕ್ಯೂಲರ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಕೂಡ ನಮೂದು ಮಾಡಿಲ್ಲ. ಮೈಸೂರು ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಎದ್ದಿದೆ. ಹೊಸ ಬುಟ್ಟಿ ಕಂದಾಯವನ್ನು ಹಾಕಿ ಬಲಪಂತ್‌ವಾಗಿ ವಸೂಲು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಕಂದಾಯದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಿಂದ ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟ ವಾದ ನಿಲುವು ಏನು ಎಂಬುದಕ್ಕೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಬರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದುದರಿಂದ ಈಗದಾದರೂ ಕೂಡ ಕಂದಾಯದ ನೀತಿ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಒಂದು ಹೇಳಿಕೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಇದರಿಂದ ರೈತರಿಗೆ ಬಹಳ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Sri H. N. NANJE GOWDA.—Sir, I am the person who brought the Bill. I have received some petitions as to how land revenue is collected on tank achkat lands also. Unfortunately, the spirit of the assurance is not being implemented. I am presenting a petition, through you, Sir, and request the Hon'ble Minister to go through this and to give necessary directions to the officers concerned.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—Sir, before the Hon. Revenue Minister replies, I would like to appeal to him that in pursuance of the assurance held out on the last occasion, clear instructions should be issued to all officers that land Revenue should be collected only on the basis of the old rates in respect of all lands till the Government take power in order to revise the resettlement after full consideration of facts.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ವಿ. ಕೌಜಲಗಿ.—ಬಾಗಾಯತು, ವೆಟ್‌ಲ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಏನು ಒಂದು ಸರ್ಕ್ಯುಲರ್‌ನ್ನು ಹೊರಡಿಸಿವೋ ಅದನ್ನು ನಿನ್ನೆ ದಿವಸ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೂ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದೆ. ಆ ಸರ್ಕ್ಯುಲರ್‌ ಹೊರತು ಬೇರೆ ಸರ್ಕ್ಯುಲರ್‌ನ್ನು ಇಷ್ಟೂ ಮಾಡಿಲ್ಲ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಶ್ರೀ ಚೆನ್ನಬಸಪ್ಪನವರು ಹೇಳಿದಂತೆ ಡ್ರೈ ರ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ವಿಷಯವಾಗಿ ನನಗೆ ತಿಳಿದ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಏನೂ ಮಾಡಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದನ್ನು ಈಗ ಪರಿಚ್ಛೇದ ಮಾಡಬಹುದು. Before we close today, I will enlighten the House about the correct position.

Point re: Petition presented by Sri Chowdiah to Chief Minister.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಎಚ್. ಜಯಪ್ರಕಾಶ್ ನಾರಾಯಣ್.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಕನ್ನಡ ಪ್ರಭಾ ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬಂದಿರ ತಕ್ಕಂಥ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಚೌಡಯ್ಯನೆಂಬವರು ಒಬ್ಬರು ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟ ಒಂದು ವಿಟಿಷ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಧೈಜವನ್ನು ನುಟ್ಟು ಹಾಕಿದ ವಿಷಯ ಮತ್ತು ಹರಿಜನರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಡೆದಂಥ ವಿಷಯ ಇದೆ. ಒಬ್ಬ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಮುಖಂಡರು ನಿನ್ನೆ ದಿವಸ ಒಂದು ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತನಾಡುವಾಗ ಯಾವುಸಾವರೂ ಒಂದು ಅಂಶವನ್ನು ರುಜುವಾತು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇ ಅದರ ರಾಜಕೀಯಕ್ಕೆ ತಿರಾಂಜಲಿಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇನೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದಾದಿಂದ ಚೌಡಯ್ಯನವರು ಅಪಾದನೆ ಮಾಡಿರುವ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಕಮೀಷನ್ ನೇಮಿಸಿ ಅದನ್ನು ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಏರ್ಪಾಡು ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—That will be looked into. Now laying of papers.

Papers Laid on the Table

Sri H. C. BORIAH (Deputy Minister for Transport).—Sir, I beg to lay on the Table of the House :

“The Mysore Motor Vehicles (6th Amendment) Rules, 1968, Notification No. DH 48 TMR 68, dated 28th December 1968 ; under section 133 (3) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1939.”

Sri B. L. GOWDA (Deputy Minister for Co-operation).—Sir, I beg to lay on the Table of the House :

“Amendment to the Mysore Weights and Measures (Enforcement) Act, 1958 ;

Notification No. DPC 69 CWM 68 (A) and (B), dated 20th December 1968 ;

under Section 43 of the Mysore Weights and Measures (Enforcement) Act, 1958.”

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The notifications laid on the Table.